WILSHIRE'S

Vol. XVI No. IX LONDON, OCTOBER, 1912 Price 2 Cents

Roosevelt and Section 6

ROOSEVELT admittedly has brought into the political situation a very complicating factor. He is unquestionably advocating a programme that will soon control a majority of the voters, but whether this will prove to be the case this November or this November four years to come is as yet uncertain.

America is on her way to the Co-operative Commonwealth, but she is not going to land there without any stops at way stations, and already Roosevelt has his flag out at the most important one—Regulation. It was necessary for the people to learn that the Trusts were a natural growth and cannot be destroyed; that the only thing to do is to regulate them preliminary to nationalising them. Two classes of people have known this for a great many years: the big Capitalists and the Socialists. But as the capitalists also knew that "destruction" as hitherto preached by the Tafts the Wilsons and Bryans really meant nothing but long winded legal squabbles with no harm done to anyone, and being of a conservative nature, they preferred the buncombe "destruction" policy to regulation. Regulation meant at least a measure of exposure and supervision, and even though the capitalists will control the exposing and the supervising they preferred to get along without it all as long as possible. However, after a quarter of a century of "destruction of Trusts" the public derision became so pronounced that finally it fell to Taft to do something. The Standard Oil Trust, or rather company, for the Trust as a Trust was transformed into a company years ago, was forced to disintegrate. Later on the Tobacco Trust, the Beef Trust, and a few others also followed suit. But while there was no evidence that these Taft disintegrations had any effect whatever either to lower prices, or to develop real competition between the disintegrated parts, nevertheless there is no doubt but that a certain section of the big capitalists like Morgan became convinced that this constant harrying of Trusts was becoming such a nuisance that they had better accept regulation and have peace. There can be little question but that Gary spoke for Morgan when he said that the Government should regulate steel prices. Nor can there be much doubt but that Perkins in backing Roosevelt is doing so with Morgan's acquiescence.

This doesn't necessarily mean that Roosevelt is Morgan's first choice; probably he may still prefer another four-year term of Taft or Wilson "destruction" to a term of Roosevelt's "regulation." But it does mean that Morgan is preparing for the inevitable, and that he recognises the day of pretended destruction has about passed, and that regulation must soon become the order of the day. Hence it is but natural that Morgan wishes to be on friendly terms with Head Regulator Roosevelt.

La Follette has been very persistent in demanding that Roosevelt disclose the source of his campaign fund. It seems to me that inasmuch as all campaign funds are contributed by those that expect a benefit to accrue, and that as Gary is frankly in favour of regulation, that it is obvious that the Morgan people are Roosevelt's principal financial backers. Moreover, it seems to me, things being as they are, that Roosevelt is quite morally justified in taking Morgan money to finance himself. Politically he, of course, cannot disclose it, any more than Wilson or Taft could afford to tell who finances them. But morally, if there are morals in politics, what objection can there be to a candidate taking money from Morgan when he frankly is advocating what Morgan and his confrères Gary and Perkins want?

In the march to Socialism America is bound apparently to pass through a phase of State regulation of industry, and even a large measure of State ownership of industries, together with more Labour regulation, Minimum Wage Bills, pensions for old age, etc. Just now Roosevelt seems destined to be the political exponent of this programme. True he declares that he offers his measures as an antidote to Socialism. We must remember that in Roosevelt's dictionary Socialism is defined as social discontent. He knows that the small capitalist would be satisfied if he were protected from the undue rapacity of the big capitalist by effective State regulation of Trusts, and that Labour generally would be equally satisfied were wages and hours fixed at figures which give reasonable compensation and leisure.

Labour and the small capitalist simply ask for the right to live according to their respective class ideals, an ideal ridiculously small and feeble in comparison with what the revolutionary Socialist demands.

For those people who wish "something now" there is no question that as between voting for Roosevelt with a chance of electing their man and getting "something" and voting for Debs with no chance at all there would seem to be but one course. Herein lies the weakness of the present reformist position of the Socialist Party. It has declared by Section 6 that anyone who is not in for "practical" politics shall be expelled from the Party. This logically leads those who are anxious to get an instalment of Socialism to vote for the man who has the best chance of getting elected and giving the instalments. Upon this proposition certainly Roosevelt rather than Debs must get their votes.

For instance, take a question like that of child labour or the Minimum Wage Bill. Both are admittedly in the class of legislation that is bound to come—that is, to come as soon as the growth of popular demand reaches a certain point. If Roosevelt is elected it would indicate that so many people

want such legislation, that it is now in the sphere of practical politics. It is futile to say that Roosevelt is insincere in his adocacy of such socialistic reforms. His insincerity or sincerity is not an issue, the issue is do the people who vote for him want these reforms? The voters are sincere certainly. If the voters want a reform enough to vote for it, we may be quite certain that politicians like Roosevelt are not going to risk their popularity by not doing all they can to give it to them.

Of course, we are familiar enough with the old argument that the best way to get Reform is to vote for Revolution, but we must remember that we are now discussing voters who want reform rather than revolution. It is useless to say that such voters are not Socialists. That may be true, but nevertheless that they do vote the Socialist ticket, and that they are considered a valuable political asset, is seen by the action of the Party in clinging to Section 6.

Roosevelt will perform an invaluable service to Socialism if he detaches every one of these voters from the Socialist Party. There is bound to be some day a separation of the reformist sheep from the revolutionary goats, and the sooner the better.

When the Socialist Party was the only party in America that was standing for social reforms, it was but natural for Reformist Socialists to vote for Debs, even though there was no hope of his success. Now that Roosevelt has launched a Reformist ticket that may win, it seems to me that those who were responsible for committing the Socialist Party to "practical" politics as per Section 6 might make a very logical defence of themselves if they themselves decide to vote for Roosevelt rather than Debs.

Berger's Hat on a Peg

I HAVE said that the agitation against Barnes in the American Socialist Party was puritanical cant, mixed with fear of losing votes that had better be lost anyway.

It is not often I find myself in accord with Victor Berger, but on this issue we are at one, so much so that I am suspicious of myself. However, while I agree with Berger upon the main issue, I must say that I hardly see why such an arch vote-catcher should press his disagreement with Debs on the matter so far as to publicly declare that he "acted as if the presidential nomination had become his personal property," and that Debs "suffers from an unduly exaggerated ego." I don't know how Debs could have acted to call forth all this rage from Berger, but no matter what he did or what he said it would seem that Berger was not doing much to put oil on the waters or to create the impression among the American workers that Debs is worthy of their votes.

Berger also said, "We shall have to get rid of the Anarchists and Syndicalists, because a Syndicalist is merely an Anarchist too cowardly to admit it." I believe that the Anarchists are saying that a Syndicalist is merely a Socialist, but too proud to admit it. However, temporarily we will pass the question and return to Berger, where he adds, "Let us who stand for International Socialism unite. We must build a stone wall against cant and hypocrisy, allied with anarchism, sabotage and murder." I am not sure that stone-wall building ever is an attractive enough game to unite people in its pursuit; but anyway, from the material Berger is using, I would have thought of a brick wall rather than a stone one.

But the gem of Berger's oration I reserve to the last: "They want to practise sabotage of the party and assassinate political action. The Barnes's affair is simply used as a peg to hang their hats on, to use a colloquial expression."

One can see what a fearful strain Berger must have been under to see him depart from his long-accustomed, conventional and stately, congressional Austro-English to a mere colloquial expression in order to properly express himself.

Berger is always Chesterfieldian; no doubt one reason he will not vote for Teddy is that the now historic phrase "My hat is in the ring" was sprung on the public with no apology for his picturesqueness.

But what is a colloquial expression, anyway? I thought it was language that working men were fed upon by politicians as a kind of literary pap, as being better for their easy assimilation from their being accustomed to it from infancy.

One thing is plain, however, and that is the kind of murderers that Berger wishes to build his stone wall against. It is the "assassins of political action." Nasty men; no doubt they would also use colloquial language without a public apology. They might even "hang their hats" to a sour apple tree if real angry.

Anarchism and Syndicalism

BERGER says that a Syndicalist is merely an Anarchist too cowardly to admit it. He defines anarchy as championing individual competition in every department of life.

Now inasmuch as Syndicalism admittedly is essentially the doctrine of the extermination of individual competition by a complete and comprehensive organisation of the workers of the world, it is difficult to understand how Berger can call such a theory as being one of unlimited competition.

As a matter of fact, Berger knows enough to know that his argument is absurd, but he thinks that his readers are ignorant enough to be fooled. I do not set out to define anarchy myself, but I do say that taking anarchy as defined by Berger then it is absurd to make it synonymous with Syndicalism.

Syndicalism looks forward to a world-wide industrial organisation of the workers. Organisation is its watchword. Individual action, whether direct or any other kind, is recognised as played out.

The Syndicalist realises that the world-wide industrial organisation of the capitalists, as seen in such organisation, for instance, as the Standard Oil Trust, must necessarily and logically find its reflex in a world-wide industrial organisation of the workers. The evolution of the Labour Trust, if it may be called such, is as sure to come as was the evolution of the Capitalist Trust.

Where Anarchists and Syndicalists agree is in saying that the capitalists are not going to surrender at the command of the ballot. But because they may agree on one point does not justify Parliamentarians like Berger making out that organisation and non-organisation are one and the same thing.

The excellent article upon "Direct Action," by Dr. Levine, which we print in this number appeared originally in the New York "Forum."

The Pregnant Knee Gives Birth to a New Theory

KNEE had a further reply to my article on "Syndicalism" in the August "British Socialist." It is interesting chiefly because it is so characteristic of the way in which the brain of the Parliamentarian Socialist works. In my rejoinder I said, "*I ask Knee directly, what does he propose to do if, when he gets his miraculous Parliamentary majority, the capitalists refuse to give up?*" He replies that "it would be (then) far easier to freeze the capitalists out if we had the whole or major part of the machinery of State in our hands."

But the particular point Syndicalists make is that the mere election of a Parliamentary majority by revolutionary Socialists does not necessarily connote the transfer of the machinery of State to the victors. True enough it ought to do so, and to-day it is certainly true enough that when one section of the capitalist party outvotes the other section they succeed peacefully to the control of the State. The other party gives up control peacefully because the vote indicates that it is in an economic minority as well as in a voting minority. Wealth is fairly equally divided between the two wings of the capitalist party, Liberal and Tory. Hence a political majority for one wing indicates not only a superior number of voters, but also a superior amount of wealth on that side. When the sitting Government is outvoted it resigns, because it is evident that the real balance of power in the country has turned against it. Then, too, the proposals of the victors even when led by a Lloyd George or a Roosevelt are really so innocuous to capital that it is not worth the candle to precipitate a physical conflict.

But if ever revolutionary Socialists should elect a majority to Parliament it would be quite a different story. If the capitalists should surrender the machinery of State to the newly-elected Socialist Parliament, they would not only be capitulating to a political party which admittedly has no economic power through the ownership of capital by its members, but they would be surrendering to a party which they knew was bent on despoiling them.

Therefore it stands to reason, it seems to me, that the capitalist class would either not allow the victorious Socialist Party to seat itself in Parliament, or if it did allow it, then it would find some means of retaining its hold of the machinery of State in defiance of the new Parliament.

Of course it would be easier to freeze out the capitalists if the Socialists had control of the army and navy, but it does not require Knee to let the capitalists know that they had better not surrender their present control, no matter who is elected, if they do not wish to be frozen out.

Socialists say that the control of the local police force is of much importance, and they seem to think that because Milwaukee turned over its municipal police to them that the same thing would happen nationally if there were a Socialist national victory. Not at all, the cases are not analogous. There is no doubt but that for the time being Labour profited by the police of Milwaukee being under the control of the Socialists, but it also cannot be doubted that if Socialist control of the local police force anywhere developed into any considerable menace to capital that State control would soon be substituted for municipal control. We have already seen what "ripper" legislation did in Pennsylvania when the bosses wished a closer grip upon the cities. The towns were not allowed to elect their mayors, let alone their chiefs of police. Even New York City loses control of its police to the State whenever the Republican Party is particularly arrogant. Of course the big cities of Europe—London, St. Petersburg, Paris and Berlin—have their police controlled by the State. We all remember that during the Debs Chicago railway strike of 1893 that President Cleveland sent in troops to awe the strikers notwithstanding that there was no call for them by either the Mayor of Chicago nor the Governor of Illinois—in fact, both protested against troops.

Knee still seems mystified about my discriminating between Socialists voting locally and voting nationally. I can't see why the difference is not plain. In voting locally they are voting for a quasi-control of their own municipal affairs, not for the Social Revolution. They know exactly what they may get by a victory, and they are under no delusion such as Knee has about it giving them control of the machinery of State and the power to freeze out the capitalists. But when Revolutionists vote in national elections they are manifestly voting for something they cannot get by a mere political victory. They vote to express an opinion.

As I said before, the workers are sure to vote for someone; they will no more abstain from voting than they will abstain from going to a football match. The Syndicalists merely wish them to understand that when they vote for a Debs or a Hyndman that they are doing nothing more than expressing a pious hope for revolution. Hopes may be useful, but action is more so.

Another mare's nest that Knee discovers in Syndicalism is that the unions may come to agreement with the capitalists at the expense of the rest of the workers. In the first place the very essence of Syndicalism is against all agreements; and, secondly, even if an agreement were made advancing the wages of union men it could not but help have a good effect upon the non-union men.

He also resents me and other "middle-class people telling us ('us' meaning 'Labour') how to manage our business." What can middle-class people know of industrial organisation? he asks. Seems to me that this sort of argument, coming from a member of the British Socialist Party, of which Hyndman is the head and front, and upon whose Executive there is probably a majority of middle-class folk, sounds funny. Perhaps he repudiates Marx, Engels, Singer, Bax, Vandervelde, and Bebel?

Perhaps he would likewise say that if you wish to know anything about germs do not go to a Pasteur, but go to the germs?

The fundamental concept of Socialism is economic determination. Given the economics and you will know what men will do. Upon this basis of pure materialism two men with the same brains and information must arrive at about the same conclusion. I take it, indeed, to-day the capitalists as a class probably know much more about the power and potentialities of the trade unions than do the workers themselves. They have better facilities for getting accurate data, and they have quite as much incentive to learn.

If the workers are going for ever to believe what is told them merely because some Lloyd George or some

Roosevelt, or even some Knee, says so rather than believe what their reason tells them is true, then I have little hope for them. In both middle-class as well as in working-class arithmetic two and two are always four.

Panama Toll and American Faith

"The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such charges shall be just and equitable."

These are the words of the treaty which is in force to-day between Great Britain and the United States.

The action of the Congress in seeking to change the plain meaning of the Treaty is significant. If the capitalists of America are quite ready to deliberately break faith with the capitalists to Great Britain over a paltry matter of tolls on the Panama Canal, is it not likely that they will break faith much more easily with the workers of this country whenever it comes to recognising a Socialist majority vote?

I am not saying that voting for Debs is not the right thing to do for a Socialist rather than not vote at all. But I do wish to point out that voting is merely wishing, and that the way to get what you wish is not merely to wish, but to have the power to command what you wish.

The Webbs on Syndicalism

"What Syndicalism Means." By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. A pamphlet published as a supplement to "The Crusade." 37, Norfolk Street, London W.C.

This is a useful little pamphlet giving fairly enough the principles of Syndicalism as enunciated by Syndicalists in France and England. It is only as an exposition, however, that it is of value; as a criticism it is valueless, inasmuch as its main attack is upon the structure of the society of the future according to the Webbs' idea of what Syndicalists wish. In the first place, the main thing that Syndicalists differ in from Socialists is as to the method of ridding the workers of capitalist rule. The Socialists say, ask the capitalists to get out by casting a vote. The Syndicalists say, get power to kick them out by industrial organisation. The Webbs do not attempt to attack the means suggested by the Syndicalists, but direct all their attention to the future after the attack is assumed to have succeeded.

The Webbs differ fundamentally from Syndicalists as to the relation of life to work. They have it that we work to get means to live, whereas Syndicalists take it that we live to work.

That is, for instance, let us suppose that we have arrived at such a future stage of perfection as to both society and the control over nature that all we need in a material way is produced automatically by machinery with no aid whatsoever from any man. Every man gets what he wants without any labour being required from him in return.

The question then arises: would men then devote themselves to some regular system of social work anyway, say of devoting themselves to the further beautifying of the earth; or would they, no longer being bound to "pay the tribute of work we have to pay to the world," continue to work anyway, or would they give themselves over to what the Webbs call "all the rest of the life to be lived"?

This question may seem so very academic that it is foolish to postulate it, but it is really an important one.

Speaking broadly, according to the Webbs society should be organised by and for *consumers*, and, therefore, when the consumers made no demand upon the community the community would make no demand on the individual. Hence he would have at his own disposal all his time to do with as he pleased, and he certainly would not please to engage in work for the mere fun of it, think the Webbs.

According to the Syndicalist theory, society should be organised by the *producers*, and work will always continue to be the great part of man's life quite irrespective of whether or not the perfection of society and machinery makes the present-day occupations necessary or not. This being true, then the industrial organisations of men are a permanency in the future social structure, just as permanent as is the physical structure of man. It is as absurd from the Syndicalist standpoint to picture the life of man as apart from work as to picture the life of a man's heart as apart from its pulsation.

Under Syndicalism the aim will be to make a man's work more vital to him, whereas by Webbs' Socialism the aim will be to make his leisure more interesting.

"Syndicalism," by J. H. Harley, M.A.

Published by Dodge Publishing Co., of New York, and T. C. and E. C. Jack, Edinburgh. 6d.

This little booklet by Professor Harley, being written by an author with no particular axe to grind, is naturally considerably fairer than the book on the same subject by Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald. The author's stumbling-block is how society is to be formed after the Syndicalists win the general strike. He does not seem to realise that the central body of the society of the future is already being formed by the federation of the various industrial unions. True enough, these organisations are to-day in such embryonic form that one may be excused for not discerning their potentialities of the future, but at any rate it would seem that Professor Harley might at least have made it clear that this is the theory of the Syndicalists, even if he does not agree with it. He says that "Syndicalism is a great and significant movement. It has its roots deep down in the recesses of the past." He notes that "American experiences amply show that the emancipation of the working classes is not going to be won by mere compulsion of numbers. Impelled by Syndicalism, the people are going in the right direction by seeing to the strength and cohesion of their own working-class combinations." There is, he says, "disposition to forget that industry goes deeper down into the aboriginal depths of society than the later politics." The book, while not as good as it might be, is yet, considering the paucity of literature at a moderate price on Syndicalism, quite well worth purchasing.

Decay of Parliament

"The Syndicalist," London

Is there any historic instance of a subjugated class using for its own emancipation the organisation that was used to emancipate the preceding class? If not, why should we now expect a new development? Previously to the development of the middle class there was no Parliament known in the sense in which we use the term to-day. Parliament was the organisation used to develop the middle class which afterwards developed into the capitalist class. It was not invented, but grew out of economic conditions. Its growth displaced the Church and Monarchy. These had been the organisations which had developed the then-governing class. Why did not the new middle class adapt the Church and Monarchy to its own requirements? These were already to hand. It did not do so because to re-model is not to follow the line of least resistance. In selecting a new instrument the men of that time were simply following a law we constantly see in operation around us. Soon our parks will be covered with dead leaves. These very leaves last year pushed out their predecessors. While they were on the tree they helped to supply life and energy for the new shoots which in turn replace them. The same holds good in society. We have just seen the Government Post Office opening new premises. It was just because business developed in the old buildings that new ones became necessary. The Government recognised what men of business always recognise, that it is easier to build new premises adapted to new developments than to reconstruct old ones.

Direct Action; Its Interpretation

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SYNDICALISM

LOUIS LEVINE, Ph.D.

"DIRECT Action." Another winged phrase which has made its way into the English vocabulary. Hardly known to English readers a few months ago, it has rapidly won a place in the stock-room of words and phrases in which our intellectual acquisitions are for convenience sake summarized. One now hears and reads the forceful phrase almost daily—a sign that it expresses some vital fact of modern life.

More than that. Though so young, the phrase already carries along with it a vast amount of emotion. It is associated with contradictory feelings, and stirs imaginations to various visions. Some pronounce it with joy and enthusiasm ; some, with bitter hatred and vehement denunciation ; some yet, with widely open eyes in which there is apprehension and dismay.

And no wonder. In America the terse phrase has made its appearance amidst most extraordinary circumstances. It emerged upon the surface of social life out of the depths of terrible industrial disturbances. It was thrown out to appease the metaphysico-causal cravings of an astonished public which stood aghast at an unparalleled trial and confession of two brother labour-leaders. It probably could not explain the fact it was meant to explain. But it, nevertheless, revealed a mystery—that somewhere in the unseen corners of our social system a tremendous work of the gravest consequences to civilization is going on, and is pressing forward to a definite end.

The dismal phrase has since stirred the world. Concrete illustrations of what it means were recently given in a series of monster strikes, such as had never been seen before. The strikes of the railroad men, of the dockers, and of the miners in England ; the Lawrence strike in this country. And there can be little doubt that the near future has in store for us a few more strikes which will drive home even to those who have eyes and see not that a new phase of social struggles is on us—struggles the character and philosophy of which are summed up in the two words : "Direct Action."

A few historical notes may introduce the reader to a broader comprehension of the subject. The phrase "Direct Action" is of French origin. Its precision and directness, indeed, testify to its origin. It was used for the first time in 1897 by Fernand Pelloutier, General Secretary of the Federation of Labour Exchanges (Fédération des Bourses du Travail). The Bourses du Travail are local federations of labour unions, sometimes of a single city or town, sometimes extending over a larger region. They take care of the general interests of the working men of a locality, and are autonomous in the administration of their own affairs. For activities of national scope, however, they are united in a National Federation, with headquarters in Paris. The Federation of Labour Bourses was organised in 1892, and Pelloutier was its secretary from 1894 until his death in 1901.

Pelloutier was a philosophical anarchist, and had no faith in the State. He was convinced that the modern State, however progressive the Government, could do nothing of permanent value for the working men. He, therefore, advised the latter to organise and to accomplish *directly* by their own efforts what they could not obtain indirectly through Parliamentary representative government.

This sounds simple enough, and the reader may ask what is there in this idea that is new and original. Had not the British Trade Unions done this before? Do not the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labour pursue the same policy? In fact, has not this become the recognized policy of trade unionism the world over ; the policy to which even employers have generally become reconciled, and which has resulted in the practice of collective bargaining and of collective contracts?

Not quite ; the similarity is only apparent, at any rate does not go beyond the surface. What Pelloutier had in mind, and what all advocates of Direct Action have had in mind since, is something entirely opposed to the fundamental ideas of English and American trade unionism of the old type. The latter has been organized along trade or craft lines. Every trade union embraces generally the skilled men only of the trade, and deals with the employers for its own members alone. Its contracts are concluded without any consideration for other working men employed in the same industry. If there are several trade unions in the same industry, their contracts generally expire at different times, so that combined action of all working men of one industry—not to speak of several industries—is hardly ever possible. The working men under this system of organization are divided into groups, each looking out for itself and strongly imbued with a feeling of group-egoism.

To fight this narrow feeling is, on the contrary, the avowed purpose of those who advocate Direct Action. Their idea is to unite all the working men of a country into one body. They stand for *Industrial Unionism* as opposed to trade or craft unionism. They want unions which should embrace all the working men of an industry, similar to the Miners' or Brewers' Federation in this country. And, furthermore, they eagerly look forward to the unification of all the industrial unions of a country into one "Big Union," which should present the united front of the working men as a class against employers as a class.

France is the country where this idea was first realized. The General Confederation of Labour, with a membership of half a million workers, is a federation of federations. Its constituent elements are the federations of separate industries, such as the Federation of Miners, the Federation of the Building Trades, and the local federations spoken of above as Bourses du Travail. The General Confederation was organized in 1895, but received its present constitution in 1902, when it amalgamated with the Federation of Bourses du Travail mentioned before. The General Confederation of Labour represents all the organized workers of France, and takes up all matters which concern the working class of France as a whole. A similar form of organization is being advocated now in England by Tom Mann and his followers. In America the idea of one "Big Union" is advocated by the Industrial Workers of the World, organized in 1905, and generally called the I.W.W., who conducted the recent strike in Lawrence.

Yet the reader may wonder whether form of organization matters so much after all. A little consideration of the question will show, however, that it is of tremendous importance. A form of organization presupposes definite technical conditions, rests upon certain general ideas, and leads to determinate collective action.

The technical conditions which have called into life the idea of industrial unions have been created by the machine invading industry after industry, and breaking down the barriers between the trades. The idea rests further on the assumption that all working men, irrespective of trade or particular employment, are connected by a common tie which binds millions of separate human units into a compact class unity. The apostles of Direct Action emphasize the fact that society is divided into classes, and frankly

proclaim their intention to deepen the chasm between the classes and to accentuate the class struggle as much as is in their power. Industrial Unionism thus becomes identical with "class-conscious" unionism—the form of organization being but the material embodiment of an implied general principle. The I.W.W. have been the representatives of "class-conscious" unionism in this country, while the General Confederation of Labour has upheld the principle in France.

An organization uniting the working men into a compact and solid body such as described above furnishes the material basis for Direct Action in all its manifestations. In the popular mind Direct Action has already become identified with violence. But, as with most popular conceptions, this one also is—though right in statement—wrong because of inadequacy of statement. Direct Action may, but must not necessarily, assume violent forms, nor would all violence be Direct Action. There must be something in the character of a labour-struggle besides and independent of violence which alone can transform it into a particular manifestation of Direct Action. This something is the spirit in which the struggle is carried on. It is the spirit of energetic pressure of the labouring mass on the small body of employers, the spirit of determination, of enthusiastic uprising, and of revolt against conditions which are declared to be intolerable. It is the spirit of a united class which opposes its solidarity and indignation to the exploitation powers of the employing class. Of course, when strikes are conducted in this spirit, violence may result. But the working men do not take the first step in this direction. At Lawrence, to take one instance out of many, the perpetrators of violence were the local authorities.

SABOTAGE; WHAT IT IS.

But how about sabotage? Is not sabotage the very essence of Direct Action, and is it not equivalent to open violence?

An illuminating answer to this question may be given by telling the story of one of the earliest manifestations of sabotage. It was in 1889. The organized dockers of Glasgow demanded a 10 per cent. increase of wages, but met with the refusal of the employers. Strike-breakers were brought in from among the agricultural labourers, and the dockers had to acknowledge defeat and return to work on the old wage-scale. But before the men resumed their work, the Secretary of the Union delivered to them the following address:—

"You are going back to work at the old wage. The employers have repeated time and time again that they were delighted with the work of the agricultural labourers who had taken our place for several weeks during the strike. But we have seen them at work; we have seen that they could not even walk a vessel, that they dropped half of the merchandise they carried—in short, that two of them could hardly do the work of one of us. Nevertheless, the employers have declared themselves enchanted by the work of these fellows; well, then, there is nothing left for us but to do the same, and to practise Ca' Canny. Work as the agricultural labourers worked. Only they often fell into the water; it is useless for you to do the same."

The advice was followed, and for two or three days the dockers applied the policy of Ca' Canny. The result was immediate. The employers called in the secretary of the union, asked him to tell the men to work as they worked before, and granted at the same time the 10 per cent. increase in wages.

This fact shows that sabotage does not always mean violence. It consists mainly in harming the interests of the employers by cleverly handling the power in the hands of the workers. It is a sort of resistance which, though effective, does not end in a walk-out and in a complete interruption of production. It is, however, designed to strike the employer in his most sensitive spot—his profits—and to make him feel that only concession can save him from loss. The following may also throw some more light on the variety and ingenuity of methods of sabotage.

The scene is now Italy, and the time of action the year 1905. The railway men were discontented, but, having lost their strike, they determined to keep up resistance while on the job. They made up their minds to follow faithfully all the regulations of the service; but too much loyalty is often as bad as direct obstruction. This was the result as described by contemporary observers.

"According to the regulations, the wickets are to be opened for the distribution of tickets thirty minutes, and should be closed five minutes before the train leaves.

"The wickets are opened. A crowd of would-be passengers hurry there full of impatience. A gentleman offers a ten-franc bill, asking for a ticket worth 4 francs and 50 centimes. The employee reads to him an article of the regulations which requests passengers to present the exact price of their ticket, to a centime. Let him, then, go and get the money. The same story is repeated with eight passengers out of ten. In spite of the customary procedure, but according to the regulations, no money is given out, not even a franc. In twenty-five minutes hardly thirty persons have obtained tickets. The rest come running out of breath with the exact amount of money in their hands. But it is too late, the wicket is closed, according to the regulations.

"But even those who have obtained tickets are not yet at the end of their sufferings. They are in the cars, but the train does not move. According to the regulations, the engines and other cars are manœuvring at some distance, and the train cannot start until they have arrived. The impatient passengers leave their cars. Immediately the inspectors are upon them, stop them, and draw up a formal report against them. Leaving the train is prohibited by the regulations."

And so on. The story could be continued ad infinitum. It was a lively experience for the Italian railway men. And it is a fine example of sabotage without violence.

But sabotage is not considered by the apostles of Direct Action as the only efficacious or even the most appropriate means of struggle. It is the solidarity of the workers that is of decisive importance. This solidarity is fostered by the industrial form of organization, and is strengthened by open and energetic strikes. The larger the scope of a strike, the more workers it involves, the surer its success and the greater its organizing and educating value for the working men.

DIRECT ACTION v. TRADE UNIONISM.

The Labour struggles carried on in the spirit of Direct Action are, therefore, quite different in character from the Labour disputes characteristic of trade unionism. The latter generally tried to foster a spirit of harmony between employers and employees, to get along peaceably, and to settle differences of wages or hours of work by means of arbitration and conciliation. The advocates of Direct Action value the struggle itself no less than the result obtained. They want an increase of wages as a result of increased combative energies; shorter hours of work as a consequence of greater moral aspirations on the part of the working men. They are anxious to keep up the readiness of the workers for defence and aggression, and this is why they repudiate long-time contracts with employers. They do not want to bind their hands for any length of time in order to be able to take up a fight whenever a good opportunity presents itself. As to the concessions won, they are convinced that only their readiness and ability to fight for their rights will protect them against the encroachments of employers.

What is this all for? Why spend so much energy for such things as an increase in wages and the like? Could not the same results be obtained with much less trouble in a smooth, quiet way?

(To be Concluded in November Number.)

Established 1900

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE

Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Company
GAYLORD WILSHIRE,
Editor.
Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents or One Shilling per year.

38, CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.
London

Vol. XVI. October, 1912. No. 9

How to Save Ettor and Giovanitti

DARROW'S acquittal of the charge of bribing a juror in the McNamara case is a matter of congratulation, but it should not be taken as any token of Labour champions in general being safe when facing a made-up case. True the charge against Darrow was so flimsy that one inexperienced would have thought that any jury would have been sure to have acquitted. But Darrow himself, and there is no one better qualified to guess what a jury may do, was extremely nervous about the result.

Probably what saved him was not so much his innocence as the fact that he is a middle-class man, and the jury being made up of middle-class men had no class prejudice against him. Then, too, as the vote for Harriman shows, there are undoubtedly a large number of middle-class Socialist voters in Los Angeles, and hence it would be practically impossible to keep the jury quite purged of them.

With Ettor and Giovanitti, who belong to the working class, the conditions will be reversed. The jury in Lawrence will, of course, be made up of middle-class men and of men who no doubt will have already made up their minds to convict. Even if they are not in this state of mind when they go into the box they will soon get into it merely from their being made so fully aware that capitalist public opinion in Lawrence is so strongly against the Labour leaders. It will not be the evidence but duty to class that will weigh with such a jury.

The only thing that will save the men is the cultivation of the idea that the indignation of Labour will be so great if conviction ensue that it will be better policy to acquit than convict.

Money spent upon defending the men in court will be largely wasted. Unless Labour is well aroused and lets the country know that it is ready to act, then no technical defence will save Ettor and Giovanitti. It is not a criminal trial, but a political one.

The real issue is not whether Ettor and Giovanitti are responsible for the death of a human being, but whether Labour shall have the right to combine and demand better wages. The raising of money throughout the world for their defence is of the greatest importance. But it is "the raising" of it and not the money itself that is of value. It is the agitation and education of the workers that counts; the money raised is largely an inconsequential bye-product.

A series of one-day-demonstration strikes taking place before the trial would be a better defence than the raising of a million dollars. What must be done to save the victims is an effective demonstration made to the country that a conviction will lead to a general strike throughout the United Staes.

If the railway men would go out for one day, or even for one hour, the day upon which Ettor and Giovanitti are brought into court there would not be much danger of any conviction.

Will not even the workers in Lawrence go out for one hour upon the appointed day?

What's In a Name?

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD has written a book on Syndicalism, published by Constable and Co., of London, at a shilling. Of course, it is needless to say that he, the prince of Parliamentarian Socialists, has no use for any programme that is going to eliminate Parliamentarians.

It is rather amusing, however, to find that after devoting the whole of his book to show the futility of Syndicalism that he practically gives away his whole case on his last two pages. He says that "the interests of both Capital and Labour are no longer local, but national and international. . . . This . . . must produce without delay great representative federations of Capital and Labour. Employers lock out men all over the country because there is trouble in one parish, workmen lay down their tools at John O'Groats because workmen at Land's End strike.

"Whilst trying to understand the meaning of these problems we ought to guard against sticking misleading labels on them. The absorption of small sectional unions and the federation of unions is not Syndicalism. It is political industrialism."

Very well, then, let us call all this new movement "political industrialism" instead of Syndicalism when we are in the presence of Mr. MacDonald. But calling it another name does not let us to see how Parliament, which is merely a number of men sent from different geographical districts of the country with no expert knowledge of these new and tremendous problems, can solve them. Why do we need to call in a mediator who knows nothing of the matter when the two great federations of Labour and Capital which Mr. MacDonald foresees can meet directly face to face? He himself sees that Labour and Capital conflicts are becoming international. If so, then how can a purely national body like Parliament settle them?

Mr. MacDonald, with all the other opponents of Syndicalism, likes to make out that Syndicalists propose that different warring groups are to own the industries of the future society. When such is stated by Syndicalists to be not true, he simply says that Syndicalists do not know their own theories. For instance, on page 38 he quotes the "Syndicalist" of London for April: "Instead of the community giving industrial control to the workers, as the Socialists fondly hope, the Syndicalists look to the worker taking such control and giving it to the community." He says that this a "definition which is erroneous in both its terms." As a matter of fact, I might say that the article which he quotes was passed upon favourably by Tom Mann, Guy Bowman, and Odon Por, and also some well-known French Syndicalists. It is perfectly sound Syndicalism, and possibly Mr. MacDonald calls it erroneous merely because he finds it unanswerable.

The Postal "Espionage" Charges

The "Literary Digest"

Flat denials from the postal authorities of Senator La Follette's charge that his mail has been rifled and "subjected to an espionage almost Russian in character" have failed to have any effect upon those of our editors who choose to take the case seriously. While some of the press receive the Senator's complaint with light sarcasm, a number of others go as far in the opposite direction, as the New York "Evening World" (Dem.), which declares: "Opening private letters that contain matter interesting or prejudicial to its heads is no habit of the Post Office Department of the United States." La Follette's charge, made in a speech to the Senate, was that some of the answers to 15,000 letters that he had addressed to postal employees for information about conditions in the service were opened in an attempt to spy upon his investigations. He declared also that men were removed from the railway mail service "for no other reasons than that they joined organisations designed to improve labour conditions in the service." A majority of our writers overlook this latter charge in their excitement about espionage. The "Evening World" declares itself not in favour of secret societies or combinations among employees in Government services, "but strongly in favour of finding out how far United States Post Office officials believe themselves empowered to detain or open private correspondence." The Senator's charge will surprise no one who has had experience of being under the displeasure of high officials or departments of this Government, the editorial says; and to back this declaration, it chronicles as follows:—

"When the 'World' was undergoing the Panama persecution at the hands of Mr. Roosevelt, then President, the private mail of this newspaper was regularly opened by some person or persons in the Post Office service.

"Again, several years ago, when the Periodical Publishers' Association sent a committee to Washington to argue the question of postal rates on second-class matter, the mail of the committee was systematically tampered with. . . . .

"Does the United States Post Office consider itself a department of a free Government, or does it model itself upon the Czar's imperial police?"

The Atlanta "Constitution" (Dem.) comes still closer to branding the Department as "Russianised," and lays the blame chiefly upon the Postmaster-General:—

"The rottenness, the oppression, and the usurpation of the Post Office Department and the department of alleged justice have discredited every utterance coming from either, and made each a stench in the nostrils of those who reverence democratic government. In a hideous burlesque at 'economy' Hitchcock has demoralised the postal service from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Great Lakes to the Gulf. As a side line, his chain of 'inspectors,' so called, have introduced into a public department of an assumed popular Government espionage, bureaucracy, and 'strong-arm' brow-beating that make the 'third-degree' methods of the surviving tyrannies of civilisation bland by comparison."

To cases cited by the New York editor, the "Constitution" adds a Southern instance:—

"In the South alone, the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and the Progressive Union of New Orleans presented enough evidence to pillory the Department. Both demanded action. It would seem the committee would have leapt at such aid in the performance of its sworn duty. It did not. As a compromise, and only after being persistently prodded, it reluctantly agreed to let postal employees come to Washington at their own expense, and testify with no guarantee whatever against the wrath of the sinister forces ruling the Department. The explanation? The only one that will occur to the average American citizen is that which rises in the chloroforming effect of a little petty post office patronage."

The Washington "Star" (Ind.), not attempting to judge the merits of the Senator's case, censures him for his method, advising that he should have made complaint immediately and formally:—

"It is unfair to the Post Office Department to intimate such irregularities in so off-hand and incidental a manner. The whole assertion will fall to the ground as a mere suspicion without basis in fact if the Senator does not promptly and peremptorily demand an investigation of the manner in which his mail has been handled both by the Post Office Department and by the Senate post office."

In reply to an inquiry about why he had not made complaint to the Post Office Department, Senator La Follette is quoted in the New York "Sun" (Ind.) as saying:—

"I did not see how anything could be gained by that method."

Jaw Bones of Asses

The "New Age"

Having predicated the determination to end the wage system, all that remains for us to do is to consider the plan of campaign. Let us, then, frankly confess that the difficulties are stupendous. Let us further confess that these difficulties are mainly in our own ranks. For example, it is painfully apparent that the political Socialists and Labourists are prompt to chortle with glee every time a strike fails. "Just what we told you," they say, smiling, and rubbing their smooth hands in invisible soap; "the day of the strike is over; you must entrust your affairs to us politicians." Of course strikes are failures. They fail because as yet there is barely a vestige of effective organisation; they fail because in most cases the leaders are inoculated with the political virus; above all, they fail for want of a true objective.

The present position is just this: an army of one million, well provided in every respect, is surrounded by an army of thirteen millions, ill-equipped, lacking in unity and almost devoid of purpose. The result is that every engagement is merely an affair of outposts. The beleagured army is content to remain where it is. It is well provisioned, well equipped, and life within its lines is distinctly agreeable. Therefore, the attack must come from the besieging army. To succeed, the attack must be the result of thorough organisation. But you cannot get thorough organisation without willing co-operation amongst the various units. What happens to-day is that here and there a sectional attack takes place. The main body of the Labour army knows nothing about it until it is too late. The political section sneers at these forlorn hopes, and calls for parley with the entrenched army. They seem to think that the possessing army will capitulate to the honeyed phrases of a MacDonald, a Snowden, a Keir Hardie. This is what comes of the Biblical tradition. They apparently do not realise that modern warfare is conducted with much more effective weapons than the jaw-bones of asses.

Progressive Anarchy

By Charles Edward Russell in the "Coming Nation"

While with large, flabby talk about good government, the tariff and honesty Wilson, Taft and Roosevelt fill the circumambient, will someone be good enough to glance for a moment at conditions as they actually are in this country of ours?

In West Virginia civil war is raging, not merely a labour disturbance, but civil war; battles are being fought, troops are manœuvering and marching against bands of men driven by conditions into actual insurrection.

In a part of Louisiana martial law has been proclaimed by the Lumber Trust, all pretence of any other government has been abolished, bands of armed men in the employ of the Trust patrol the country roads and streets of the towns, men are seized and imprisoned without warrant or driven from their lawful habitations, or shot down if they utter protest.

In San Diego the self-constituted vigilantes walk the streets, privileged to knock down and torture any working man against whom they have a dislike. Three hundred and one men have been illegally arrested and imprisoned, 89 have been assaulted and beaten by the police and the vigilantes, two have been killed by the same agencies, 55 have been exiled from the city without warrant or proceedings, seven have been kidnapped, many have been subjected to indescribable tortures, the gaols have been crowded to suffocation with prisoners whose only offence is the exercise of their constitutional rights, city employees have turned the fire hose upon persons engaged in peaceful religious meetings, and a reign of terror inaugurated that has already lasted for months and about which the people of the country at large have absolutely no information.

In every part of the country labour is restless, uneasy, resentful, and increasingly insistent in its demands. Steadily the great irrepressible conflict pushes its way forward.

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press Limited (Trade Union and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.